



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

circumstances, it will take many a year to repair the damage thus done to that very civilization in whose name our government has sought to justify its extraordinary conduct. The past will not, possibly cannot, be undone, but let us as a people look fully in the face the disastrous consequences sure to come in "the fullness of time" from every such unworthy exploit and letting down of the moral ideals of the nation, in the interest of commercial or political enterprises, and let us make it impossible for any Administration of this great people ever to do such a thing in our name again.

PAX PACE.

The Urgent Need of a Truce and Reduction of Armaments.

Abstract of a recent speech in the French Chamber of Deputies by Mr. Gustave A. Hubbard, when the Budget for the Department of Foreign Affairs was under consideration. Mr. Hubbard at the end of the speech presented a resolution asking the French Government to take the initiative in bringing about an agreement for a reduction of the present burdensome armaments and war budgets.

When the delegate from Sweden and Norway at the Hague Conference, Baron de Bille, learned that the Russian proposition relative to the limitation of armaments had been set aside, he cried, "That is not enough!" It is to repeat that cry of the delegate of Sweden and Norway, and of all consciences which approve it, that I rise to make a few observations. It is not enough that we should be satisfied with the improvements in the external situation of the French Republic, to which the previous speaker, Mr. Deschanel, has referred, and that, conscious of our strength, we should bide our time.

Reference has been made to the great design of Russia, the great design of Germany; but should not France also have her great design? Are we agreed as to what that great design should be? That is the question which Mr. Deschanel has left somewhat obscure. As was said in the report on the Foreign Affairs Budget, discussions on foreign politics are not sufficiently frequent in this Chamber and in this country. The country has not formed the habit of looking calmly at all these problems. That is a habit which I think we ought to form. It is not sufficient, indeed, to deliver here historical and academical speeches. We have political responsibilities. We ought to be men of action, and not simply men of contemplation.

The manner in which the Chamber proceeds in the study of these questions is bad. It would be useful to have printed and distributed in the Chamber, if not daily as in England, at least once a week, a list of questions to be put to the Prime Minister with his answers to the questions asked the preceding week. If we would try this method, we might have every Thursday an understanding between the government and the representatives of the country. Then as soon as a question was brought up, whether that of Morocco or of Siam or any other, it could be examined immediately. We should thus form the habit of discussing these questions briefly and concisely. I shall submit a resolution to this end at the close of my remarks.

You have in mind, gentlemen, what Mr. Deschanel has just said further. He has treated of the system of great alliances, of the balance of power, which accord-

ing to the supporters of the armed peace is the true process for the assuring of peace. As for me, I discover something in the betterment of our foreign relations of a different nature from the effect of great alliances. I see in it the definite, united, more and more continuous coöperation not only of the European powers but of all the powers. Our conception of what the general progress of humanity ought to be is very different from that of those who rely upon the system of great alliances. I believe that the words peace and civilization recently uttered in England, as they had been in Paris, by the King of Italy, are becoming the motto of sovereigns as they have always been the motto of peoples, and as they are especially the motto of our French democracy. But we must not leave this in the region of words, of speeches. We must come down to the earth, to facts. The fools, gentlemen, are not those who dream of this transformation through the coöperation of peoples. The fools are those who have organized, maintained and daily increase the crushing burden of the armed peace. The fools are those who keep up bloated armaments on land and sea.

I see that Mr. Deschanel defines the Russian Alliance as the cornerstone of French politics. But he does not indicate what profit France is to receive from this alliance unless it be the "great design," of whose nature he gives us no information. Though the Minister of Foreign Affairs is not charged with the duty of looking after the material interests of the nation, it is pertinent to ask of him if it is not strange after so many years of the alliance to hear demands like those of a large number of our colleagues representing the wine-producing regions of France; it is pertinent to call the attention of the government to the excessive duties laid upon the wines and principal agricultural products of France on their entry into the Muscovite empire. Does not the matter of industrial and literary property also require immediate attention?

But I let pass these material interests. I take up the chief interests, the most pressing questions, and I ask in turn if we ought not to have a very different conception of the benefits which this alliance, the cornerstone of our politics, may bring to France? It is easy, it seems to me, if we keep in mind the Hague Conference, to discover what ought to be the nature of the great design reliable, practicable, advantageous, and useful to France. It consists in what Mr. Deschanel seems unwilling to support; first, an arrest of the excessive burden of armaments, preparatory to their reduction. This reduction is precisely what this alliance invites us to make. It is interesting to notice that it is the men who have borne the burden of office, responsible and conservative men, who, when out of power and free to speak, are the first to set forth the folly of the militarism in which the European powers live.

In 1880 Baron Herbst, former Minister of State in Austria, in a great debate on the Address to the Crown, said calmly and without circumlocution that it was his duty to predict for the military states of Europe general bankruptcy if they continued to follow the policy to which they were devoted and in which there seemed no means of stopping. In the same year Von Moltke, the defender of war, as you know, said: "Who can deny that all Europe is groaning under the weight of an armed peace? Mutual defiance keeps the nations facing each

other under arms." He thought that this distrust could be more easily removed by an agreement of government with government than by any other sort of means, as, for example, international fraternity, international parliaments, etc., on which he cast contempt.

People talk about Utopists, fools, dreamers, people without equilibrium, and here are ministers of a monarchy and generalissimos who announce outright to Europe that it is on the way to bankruptcy, that the present situation is intolerable. But since 1880 has any arrest of the growth of armaments been found? On the contrary, it seems to have been accelerated. We have reached 1903, and in Mr. Théry's book, "Armed Peace," I find two tables of figures with which all the tax payers of Europe ought to be acquainted. For the army alone, in 1891, the six great European powers expended annually 2,873,000,000 francs. Now after twelve years the sum has grown to 3,953,000,000 francs, that is, an increase of 50 per cent. For the army and navy together the amount spent in 1891 was 3,795,000,000 francs. This year it is 5,884,000,000. To these sums must be added the extraordinary expenses connected with the army and navy, for strategic railways, etc. The increase during this period has been for Russia 65 per cent, for Germany 55 per cent, for England 117 per cent, for France only 43 per cent. France, because she has completed her equipment, is perhaps better ready than the others for an arrest of these expenses. But should this satisfy us? When one reads the pessimistic discourses about the finances of the Republic, one is inclined to ask whether this arrest will not be forced upon us.

It is true that publicists like Mr. Théry and Mr. Etienne present figures to show that France has never been more prosperous than under these crushing military burdens. The money, they think, being spent on internal equipments, only passes from the pocket of one citizen into that of another. If this were true, it would seem that we might increase indefinitely our army and navy budgets with advantage. Mr. Bourgeois has answered this sophism by saying that it would be well to ask if in place of all these unproductive expenses it would not be profitable to employ these resources on the public works which cannot now be realized and before which you are brought to a halt every instant. Would it not be better to employ them for the amelioration of the conditions of the existence of the citizens? I believe that the first circular of Count Mouravieff uttered the truth when it said that the reduction of armaments was "the ideal to which the efforts of all governments ought to be directed." Let us declare that we wish this reduction, and let us enter upon the way which leads to it. Then we shall have a right to say that our alliances are profitable, that these visits, these cordial relations, these *ententes* will come to something tangible in the interests of the populations.

It is well that we should take account of what was done by the Hague Conference from which so much was expected. What took place in that Conference as regards the limitation of military expenses? Nothing was done to solve these difficulties. The Russian propositions were examined and the technical committee reported unfavorably on them, because the time was not yet ripe, and because of the impossibility of fixing a basis for the

determination of the number of the forces and the distribution of authority among the powers.

When the subject came before the larger committee, the delegate from the French Republic succeeded in getting adopted a resolution which indicates the way which we must take in the matter. The Conference finally expressed the wish "that the governments, taking note of the propositions made in the Conference, propose the examination of the possibility of an agreement concerning the limitation of the armed forces on land and sea and of the military budgets." I ask of the Minister of Foreign Affairs kindly to tell us what efforts he has put forth with other governments to carry out this wish of the Hague Conference. And I further ask of the Chamber to declare in a resolution that it invites the government to present the next budget without any increase, and that it enter into negotiations with foreign governments on the subject of the limitation of army and navy expenses. I ask of the French Chamber of Deputies to follow the program proposed by the Emperor of Russia, which he certainly has not abandoned.

It is not proposed that we should take a leap in the dark and proceed by ourselves alone to decree disarmament. But we should say that we have reached the limit of normal expenses; that the condition of our people and of our finances, though better, perhaps, than that of the surrounding powers, compels us to notify the public that it is absolutely necessary that we should go no further in this march toward the abyss of ruin.

Allusion has been made to the opposition at the Hague Conference of the German delegate, Mr. Schwarzhoff. His opposition sprung from the fact that in Germany the war budget is voted for seven years in advance. Such an obstacle, however, to the study of the administration of the military affairs of the powers signatory of the Hague Conference is serious though not insurmountable. Why not by vote bring this matter to the attention of the entire world? Perhaps public opinion can be brought to surmount this obstacle. It is not rash to hope so. We must show that it is not the obstinate refusal of France to coöperate in a work of general benefit that places us in this situation.

It seems to me that Mr. Deschanel has omitted one of the chief factors in the question. He mentioned the chancellors, ministers, diplomats, but he did not mention the working men and the democrats of the world. It is the producers, those engaged in the industries, in commerce, in the pacific callings of the world, who are asking if these great purposes must always be put off "to the Greek Calends." If we must wait to enter upon this course until all the political questions of the East and the extreme East, and other continental questions, are settled, it is evident that the armed peace will last forever.

Assuredly it is what these eminent statesmen call folly which is bringing to bankruptcy and ruin the countries which are burdened with these enormous expenses. It is said that there are neutral states in Europe and the immense continent of America which escape these enormous burdens. But they do not escape them completely. States are now interdependent from the economic point of view. Even the neutral suffer from these burdens, and in the long run a very severe damage may be done to their prosperity. Some armament is without doubt necessary, but it is not necessary that it

be heavy enough to crush the very body which it is charged with defending and cause it to contract deadly disease.

In view of the numberless bonds which unite different peoples to-day, religious, intellectual, as well as industrial and commercial, in view of the great interest taken by the workingmen and the masses of the common people in a closer union of the populations of different countries, do not be astonished that we are inviting you to go forward vigorously toward general pacification, toward the limitation of armaments, toward more and more general coöperation for the well-being of humanity. This is a great design, the carrying out of which is surely not the work of a single day, but it is nevertheless realizable. Jules Simon, Laboulaye and all the great men who have reflected on these things have advised the peoples of the world to proceed in this manner. Even in Germany, where religious influences have been used in support of a policy of military oppression, you find evidences of the same interest in justice which is so moving our French people. The men of science and of humanity in Germany, if not the religious men, admit the existence in the military system of a great obstacle to the establishment of a state of things in Europe truly human and pacific. It was a Professor of Philosophy, Dr. Molinaert, who organized the Franco-German League of Munich. In Sweden and Norway and other neutral countries the groups of scientific men, the positivists, the materialists, the freethinkers, are treating these questions with deliberation and calmness, and insisting that they everywhere receive conscientious consideration. We Frenchmen see coming to our aid from all these parts of the world these men who are demanding simply the emancipation of peoples in accordance with the principles of justice and right.

In England Mr. Frederic Harrison, a leader of the positivists and freethinkers, has opposed the detestable military enterprises directed against the independence of small peoples. He pleads for the solidarity of the civilized nations. He declares that the worst scourge of our epoch, the source of wars and all these horrible preparations for war, is a perverted nationalism, an unbridled imperialism, the desire of domination over other peoples, the ambition to create a gigantic empire which can exist only by permanent oppression.

Twenty years ago when our friends Frédéric Passy and Gaillard developed here in this Chamber the idea of arbitration, if they had been told that there would one day be a permanent treaty of arbitration between France and England, they would indeed have been astonished. I remember the first meetings of the Interparliamentary Conference in quarters which had nothing official about them. I remember how the Conference was neglected by all and even generally derided. To-day it is everywhere received in the first Chambers, in the Senates of the nations. It is fêted and treated as princes and sovereigns are treated. That indicates a very great advance.

In the Yellow Book which has been published on the subject of the Anglo-French Arbitration Treaty, the Minister of Foreign Affairs disclaims the credit of having brought about this treaty. He declares that it was brought about by a general movement of public opinion in the two countries. You were right, Mr. Minister, in

following public opinion. I think you might follow it a little more closely; that you might even sometimes go in advance of it. I think that you have not sufficient confidence, notwithstanding your Arbitration Treaty, in the juridic organization of the nations which is proposed, in the very practical blessings and benefits which such an organization would immediately bring about in the development and prosperity of our own country. You are evidently too timid when you treat of questions of arbitration. You have limited your treaty to five years. You seem to think that at the end of five years it will not have been put into operation, that it will have been forgotten, and that there will be no occasion to renew it. You seem to take real pleasure in indicating that what is proposed is a small matter of very short duration, the work of an instant.

I understand very well that you have made the treaty limited for the sake of satisfying the public, as you have declared that you will never submit questions of honor or of vital interest. It hardly needed to be said that in questions of arbitration the national independence is always reserved. When you submit to an arbitration you have resolved in advance to abide by the judgment. Of course, there can be no agreement to submit a question the award on which the people could not accept. It is the same tendency which has caused you to decline to establish a general procedure, which has caused you to limit the treaty to five years, the fear, that is, of seeing organized a regular normal state of affairs.

There is, further, something stronger than words and texts, namely facts. How will you account for the fact that, since the institution of the Hague Court, France has not taken occasion to bring before it even one of those juridic controversies of a secondary character which have so long been pending? America had to set us an example and put the Hague Court into operation. By a vigorous resolution the President of the United States on the occasion of the Venezuela trouble refused to be arbitrator, and declared that it was before the Hague Court that the first great international trial in which the deeds of war were to be examined should be discussed. At all events, the deeds of war have been brought to the bar of this tribunal and examined in the light of the principles laid down by the Hague Conference. I should like, Mr. Minister, for your administration to support the jurisdiction of the Hague Court with all your influence. I should like to see France in the first rank among the nations who wish to see such institutions developed.

In your budget there is an item, "Expenses for the Hague Court," but you put down no figures. You simply recall the subject. I understand. You are in an attitude of waiting. You are waiting to have transmitted to you the demand which will let you know what is your quota. You are evidently showing systematic coolness and abstention in the presence of this institution.

Mr. Delcassé: Will you allow me a word?

Mr. Hubbard: Gladly.

Mr. Delcassé: I received recently from the Administrative Council of the Hague Court a statement of the part of the expenses of administration of the Permanent Court which falls to France. Immediately I put the sum into the statement of supplementary credits which

is submitted to the Chamber. The amount is 15,673 francs.

Mr. Hubbard: I am happy to see that we are coming to an agreement. I for one do not complain of the increase in the amount since last year, and I certainly think you will not complain. As to putting the item into the budget, it seems that with the aid of the amount of the previous year you might have put it in in advance.

In place of showing this sort of coldness toward this institution, I shall ask you to go further and to consider that this matter is not one simply of material expense, but that it has a moral significance. I shall ask you to imitate the conduct of Sweden, of Norway, of Switzerland, and of Denmark, which for several years have put into their budgets a very modest subvention of a thousand francs for the Permanent Peace Bureau at Berne, a universal institution in which participate all the peace associations, the jurists, the international law institutes, etc., which throughout the world are laboring in the direction which I am indicating.

Finally, Mr. Minister of Foreign Affairs, since you seem to be entering upon the pathway of concession and coöperation, I hope you will recognize with us that the French Republic ought to occupy itself with the constitution of a regular system of international law, which will be the object of the decisions of the Hague Court. I hope that you will be able, either alone or in concert with the Minister of Justice, to appoint a preparatory commission analogous to that proposed by Mr. Asser and other jurisconsults, in order that gradually there may be created a body of rules and regulations no longer purely conventional and between a few of the states, but established by the entire body of states which constitute the juridic society of the civilized nations, which it is desirable to have take the place of the ancient alliances, which by force and violence disputed with one another for the empire of the globe.

It is of importance, as well, that this should be done in the interests of our citizens abroad, who are often not properly cared for. An organized system of international justice, such as I have spoken of, would make it easy to bring immediate aid to those abroad who have reason to complain of injustice.

Our democracy, which desires to have established a regular juridic organization between the nations, knows very well that from the historic point of view it is from special events that law arises; but it is to be hoped that hereafter law will, on the other hand, direct events.

This hope the French Republic ought to encourage in an effective way by its decisions and its votes. The Chamber should invite the Government not to increase further the military and naval expenses, and to enter upon negotiations with a view to a limitation of these expenses. France ought not to wait always for another country to take the initiative in calling international conferences. I ask the government of the French Republic to aid this great movement which is spreading throughout the entire world, and not to put any obstacles in its way, but to give it its complete and cordial support.

Reciprocity with Canada.

From an Address of Hon. Samuel W. McCall.

At the annual dinner of the Merchant's Association of Boston on December 10th the subject of reciprocity with Canada was discussed. The speakers were Senator John W. Daniel of Virginia, Senator Quarles of Wisconsin, Governor Cummins of Iowa (whose speech, in his absence, was read by Hon. C. S. Hamlin), Mr. C. S. Mellen, President of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad, and Hon. Samuel W. McCall, member of Congress from Massachusetts. Mr. McCall's speech was in that lofty spirit which characterizes all his utterances, and was in substance as follows:

"At a meeting of the merchants of Boston I know of no more fitting subject to talk upon than our trade relations with the great country to the northward, which is our nearest neighbor. Canada, according to her population, is by far the best customer this nation has in the world. She buys of us about \$125,000,000 worth of goods each year, which is more than twice as much in the aggregate as we sell to the whole of Central and South America, with Mexico and the Philippine Islands thrown in. Her relations with us are so intimate and so peculiar that a reciprocal trade arrangement would not be subject to any of those objections, some of them sound and some fantastic, which are commonly urged against reciprocity agreements.

"Important lines of railroads and navigable rivers run from the interior of one country into or alongside the other, while the chain of great lakes lying between the two countries invite to commerce and make difficult of enforcement any of the ordinary restraints upon international trade.

"She has similar institutions and similar peoples. Her climate, which has a most important bearing upon industry, supplements our own.

"Products vary in character more upon lines of longitude than of latitude, and industries of a northern and a southern people are less likely to conflict with each other than those of nations which lie side by side upon the same parallels of latitude. The sun and birds do not more naturally migrate to the one country in the summer and return again to the other in the winter than do the natural currents of trade run across the border which separates Canada from the United States.

"If we are to be kept apart it must be purely by the decrees of the statesmen and in defiance of all the laws of nature. If there can ever be a case where the special interests and desires of two neighboring peoples should be considered in adjusting the trade relations, that case exists here.

"Our trade with Canada has been of modern growth, and the story of it is quickly told. Before 1847 her preferential tariffs in favor of Great Britain confined almost all of her foreign commerce to that country. So late as 1850 the total trade going both ways between Canada and the United States was less than \$5,000,000 a year.

"In 1854 we entered into a trade policy with reference to Canada by which free exchange was confined largely to natural products.

"By the action of the United States this treaty was abrogated in 1866. The tendency of trade between the